54

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/071,900	05/04/1998	JOCHEN HUMMEL	425.001	5984

22907   7590   01/13/2005

BANNER & WITCOFF
1001 G STREET N W
SUITE 1100
WASHINGTON, DC 20001

EXAMINER
EDOUARD, PATRICK NESTOR

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2654	

DATE MAILED: 01/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>08/23/2004</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This Office Action is in response to communication filed 8/23/2004. Claims 1-13, 16-18,

22-24 are pending. Claims   25-43 are canceled.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments filed 08/23/2004 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive because of the following reasons:

In response to Applicant's argument that Lakritz discloses a parser that "uses a rule-based

approach to identify translable text in HTML, the examiner cannot concur. In fact, Lakritz

teaches at col. 7, lines 40-45, "the parser reads the HTML document and parses it into ...by the

invention. The default rule and external rules are appied while parsing a and text segments

are marked as either translatable or non-translatable. Therefore, Lakritz's rule based parser can

identify non-translatable text document.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth
> in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior
> art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made
> to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be
> negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1, 5, 7, 8, 10-13, 17, 18 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Carbonell et al (WO 94/06086) in view of Lakritz (6,623,529)

As per claim 1, Carbonell et al teach a method for processing source information

comprising the steps of:

"Parsing input source information into elements   (figure 9, his parser 910);

"Identifying an element as a source placeable element by predetermined criteria based on

the content of the element" (suggested by col. 16, line 1 through col. 17, line 35, the SGML tags

are used to identify the content of the document and to assist in translating currencies)

"converting at least a portion of said source placeable element into a target placeable

element" (col. 17, lines 1-35).

It is noted that Carbonell teach the claimed invention but does not explicitly teach

identifying the element according to a rule based query.. However, this feature is well known in

the art as evidenced by Lakritz who teaches at col. 7, lines 20-30 and lines 40-45, the parser

uses a rule based approach to identify translatable and non-translatable text in a document and

the rules are specified in an external rule definition file. Therefore one having ordinary skill in

the art at the time the invention was made would have it obvious to incorporate into Carbonell's

system the rule parser as taught by Lakritz because it would provide a system capable of

identifying translatable or non-translatable text with high degree of accuracy.

As per claim 5, Carbonell et al teach teaches designating a type of said source placeable

element (col. 17, lines 1-35)

As per claims 7, Cabonell teaches converting a source placeable element into a language

independent format (col. 16, lines 1-17).

As per claim 8, Carbonell et al teach determining whether the source placeable element is a proper noun; (col. 17, lines 1-35).

As per claims 10-13, and 16, Carbonell et al teach determining whether said source placeable element is a proper noun (col. 17, lines 1-35); converting said placeable into a language independent format (col.16, lines 1-17).

5.   Claims 2-4, 6, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carbonell et al (WO 94/06086) in view of Lakritz (6,623,529) and further in view of Murrow et al (EPO 0668558).

As per claim 2, it is noted that the combination (Carbonell with Lakritz) teaches the claimed invention but does not explicitly teach determining a source locale. However, this feature is well known in the art as evidenced by Murrow et al who teach the localization of a computer program at col. 1, line 1- col. 2, line 37, and col. 8, line 13-30. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have it found obvious to determine the source locale in the combination system as taught by Murrow et al because it would guide the localizer in localizing some of the locale specific data that would provide a better translation

As per claim 3, the combination of Carbonell with Lakritz teaches applying a source placeable identifier to determine a type of said source language (col. 17, lines 1-35).

As per claim 4, Murrow et al teach determining a target locale (his target locale)

As per claim 6, Murrow et al teach applying said source locale...(col. 9, line 18 through col. 10, line 14).

As per claim 9, the combination of Carbonell with Lakritz and Murrow teaches determining said placeable is a date (col. 17, lines 1-35) converting said date into a target information according to a target locale (col. 17, lines 27-30; see also, Murrow's col. 8, lines 13-16).

6.   Claims 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carbonell et al (W0 94/06086) in view of Lakritz (6,623,529) and further in view of Beauregard et al (5,974,413)

It is noted that the combination of Carbonell with Lakritz teaches at col. 17, lines 32-35, the system is capable in assisting in translating currencies and mathematical unit but does not explicitly teach wherein converting at least a portion of said source placeable element requires a calculation for converting a source currency into a target currency said calculation for converting is automatic. However, this feature is well known in the art as evidenced by Beauregard et al who teach at col. 10, lines 14-32, a system for activating content functions called Active Words wherein the contents functions include content transformations such as language translation currency conversion and date transformations etc. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have it obvious to incorporate into the combination the ActiveWords as taught Beauregard because it would provide to the system the capability of converting for instance currency that would make the system more versatile capable of performing complex functions.

6.   Claims 15-24 are the same in scope and content as claims 1-13 and 16 and therefore are rejected under the same rationale.

7.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

9.   Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231 or faxed to:

(703) 3 08-905 1, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or: (703) 305-9508 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or

"DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 11, 2121 Crystal Drive,

Arlington. VA.,Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to Patrick N. Edouard whose telephone number is (703) 308-6725. The

examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday from 07:30 a.m.-6:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Richemond Dorvil, can be reached on (703) 305-9645.

The facsimile phone number for this Art Unit is (703) 872-9314. Alternatively, facsimile

messages may be sent directly to (703) 305-9644 where they will be stored in the examiner's

voice mailbox (telling the examiner that a fax was received) and be automatically printed (i.e. -

no delay by the examiner).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be

directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

Patrick N. Edouard

January 8, 2005

PATRICK N. EDOUARD
PRIMARY EXAMINER